

REMARKS

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 are amended and claims 3, 4, 8-10 and 16-18 are canceled. No new claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5-7, 11-15 and 19-26 remain pending in the Application. Independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 are amended to include limitations that define the invention over the cited art. Applicants submit the application is now in condition for allowance in view of the amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Pursuant to the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-16 and 19-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al. (5,755,678) in view of Parikh et al. (5,133,199). The Office Action states that Parker et al. discloses a medical bandaging material comprising a warp knitted fabric having stitches, a moisture activated reactive system, a tubular wrapping surrounding the substrate, a moisture-free foil container and a means for resealing the container. Applicant agrees that Parker et al. discloses these elements.

The Office Action further states that Parker et al. does not disclose chain stitches constructed from fiberglass yarns and inlay stitches constructed from inelastic low modulus polymeric yarns, however, Parikh et al. discloses a stretch bandage having a chain stitch and inlay stitch, wherein the yarns include acrylic fibers such as polypropylene. While Applicant agrees that Parker et al. does not disclose fiberglass chain stitches and inelastic low modulus polymeric yarn inlay stitches, Applicant disagrees that Parikh et al. discloses the stitch composition of amended independent

claims 1, 6, 14 and 26, and further, that the combination of the stitch arrangement and materials of Parker et al. and Parikh et al. would not combine to produce the substrate composition of amended independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 26.

Claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 as originally presented provided a chain stitch (wales) made from fiberglass and an inlay (weft) made from an inelastic low modulus polymeric yarn to prevent fraying of the cut ends of the substrate. Claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 have been further amended to include "wherein the polymeric yarn constitutes between 10-25% of the total weight of the substrate, the fiberglass yarns constitute between 75-90% of the total weight of the substrate, the density of the threads in the substrate is between 40-60 stitches in the widthwise direction and 70-90 stitches in the lengthwise direction, and extensibility of the substrate is between 30-50% in the widthwise direction and 20-60% in the lengthwise direction." These further requirements are not found or taught in/by either Parker et al. or Parikh et al. Support for the percentage compositions of the materials can be found in at least [0015] and [0016] of the Application. Support for the thread density can be found in at least [0037] of the Application. Support for the extensibility can be found in at least [0035] and [0036] of the Application.

Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 as amended herein. Specifically, Parikh et al. discloses and teaches a cotton yarn inlay stitch and a polyester or polyester/cotton blend for the wales (chain stitches). See *col. 2, lines 36-41 and col. 6, lines 1-19*. Cotton is not an inelastic low modulus polymeric yarn as required by the amended claims. The disclosed stitch pattern and materials of Parikh et al. provide an elastic, soft bandage product that is not hardened with a reactive system, and does not include fiberglass. The combination of Parker et al. and Parikh et al. would produce an elastic bandage with a fiberglass/polyester wale and cotton inlay, which is not the substrate as claimed in amended claims 1, 6, 14 and 26. Further, the added component percentages and

limitations of amended claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 further limit the substrate to a suitable operating range for a substrate that successfully functions with a reactive system. The bandage produced by the combination of Parker et al. and Parikh et al. would not be suitable for use with a reactive system, and least in part due to its elasticity. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 11-13, 15 and 19-25 depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 26 and include the limitations of those claims, thus, dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 11-13, 15 and 19-25 are patentable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 5, 7, 11-13, 15 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

The Applicant has endeavored to be fully responsive to all of the Examiner's concerns, and believes that the Application as amended is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned directly to resolve any remaining issues. This response is being timely filed and does not include more independent or total claims than paid for previously. If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response not already accounted for, the Examiner is authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 01-0265. If a petition for an

extension of time and fee is required, such petition is hereby made and the Examiner is likewise authorized to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 01-0265. Any overpayment or refund should be credited to Deposit Account No. 01-0265.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey S. Bernard/

Jeffrey S. Bernard
Registration No. 50,020
Attorney for Applicants

ADAMS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.A.
201 South College Street
Suite 2350 Charlotte Plaza
Charlotte, NC 28244
Tel: (704) 375-9249
Fax: (704) 375-0729
E-mail: jsb@adamspat.com
Attorney Docket No. 2765/156US